

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 9, 11-19 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-6 and 8-20 stand rejected. Claims 8, 10 and 20 have been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 8-13 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goren et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0026248 hereinafter Goren) in view of Dunn et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,529,209 hereinafter Dunn). Claims 2-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goren et al. in view of Dunn et al. and further in view of Tian (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0146123 hereinafter Tian). Claims 4, 6 and 16-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goren et al. in view of Dunn et al. and further in view of Tian and further in view of Livingston (U.S. Pat. No. 6,621,590). Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goren et al. in view of Dunn et al. and further in view of Tian and further in view of Livingston and further in view of Parikh et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,801,697 hereinafter Parikh). Claims 14-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goren et al. in view of Dunn et al. and further in view of Bernheiser (U.S. Pat. No. 5,587,747). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicant notes independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of “the array of diamonds includes a plurality of white diamonds

each having an area between 20 and 40% of an area defined by a specified text character in the font of the text[,] and an area of each of the array of diamonds is selected to correspond to a size of the text to confuse the eye when the array of diamonds is imposed over the text.” Similarly, independent claim 16 has been amended to include “select a size of the geometric pattern to correspond to a size of the text to confuse the eye when the geometric pattern is imposed over the text” and “wherein the geometric pattern defines a white area between 20 and 40% of an area defined by a specified text character in the font of the text.” Applicant submits these features are not taught nor suggested by Goren, Dunn, Tian, Livingston, Parikh and Bernheiser either alone or in combination.

In particular, none of the cited references disclose selecting a geometric pattern, based on the size of the text, to confuse the eye. Rather, the cited references appear to disclose only the use of an obscuring mosaic on a computer screen, and not a geometric pattern correlated to the size of the text on the screen to maximize the disruptive effect of the geometric pattern. Specifically, Applicant’s geometric pattern has been found to work especially well to confuse the eye when selected to correspond to the size of the text. Additionally, the use of a white area between 20% to 40% of an area defined by a specified text character has also been found to be especially effective in confusing the eye. To the contrary, with the cited references, it appears that color, in connection with a pattern, is a primary element in attempting to obscure text on a display screen that is being viewed without the benefit of a filter (i.e., color-tinted glasses).


Accordingly, as Goren, Dunn, Tian, Livingston, Parikh and Bernheiser fail to teach these features as claimed, Applicant respectfully asserts independent claims 1 and 16 are patentable over the cited references and in condition for allowance. In addition, as claims 2-6, 9-15 and 17-19 depend from independent claims 1 and 16, Applicant respectfully submits these claims are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 9, 2005

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686
Erica K. Schaefer, Reg. No. 55,861

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/EKS/ps